

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended. New claims 12-14 have been added as dependent claims to allowed claim 11. New claim 15 includes the limitations of claim 5 rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of claims 1, 3 and 4. New claim 16 depends from claim 15 and tracks the limitations of claim 2. New claims 17-20 have been added as dependent claims to claim 1. The amendments to claims 1 and 6 and the new claims are supported by at least Figures 1-6 and the related description of those Figures in the present application. No new matter has been added.

§103 Rejections

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown (US 5,749,538) in view of McCarthy (US 4,098,469). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Brown discloses a dispensing mechanism for dispensing two rolls of sheet material. The device includes a housing 38 with an opening for dispensing the sheet material. The rolls are supported on spindles 22 that extend perpendicularly from arms 18. The arms 18 extend perpendicularly from a strut 14 that is mounted flat against a rear wall of the housing. The arms 18 are connected to a common strut 14 so that the arms 18 and spindles 22 rotate together as a single unit. The spindles 22 are arranged vertically above and below each other when in a dispensing position and therefore are not aligned axially.

McCarthy discloses a toilet paper holder having an elongated extended chute for holding a plurality of rolls of paper in vertical stacked relation. The rolls move vertically downward in the chute as the rolls at the bottom of the stack are depleted and removed. The holder includes a door 16 arranged to cover an opening 18 at a bottom of the holder. The door 16 is movable vertically into an open position wherein the paper can be exposed for dispensing and the door holds the stack of rolls up and out of the way of the roll being used.

Brown and McCarthy fails to disclose or suggest a dispenser housing that includes "a door slideably supported in a portion of the opening and slideable horizontally between a first door position and second door position," as required by claim 1. Brown and McCarthy further fail to disclose or suggest a pair of mandrels that "extend in opposite directions in axial

alignment with each other," as required by claim 1. Therefore, Brown and McCarthy fail to disclose or suggest every limitation of claim 1 and the claims that depend from it.

Claims 6-9 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Brown in view of McCarthy and further in view of Stanland (US 6,491,251). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Brown and McCarthy fail to disclose or suggest "a door slideably supported in a portion of the opening and slideable horizontally between a first door position and a second door position," or mandrels that "extend in opposite directions in axial alignment with each other," as required by claim 6 for at least those reasons discussed above related to claim 1. Stanland fails to remedy the deficiencies of Brown and McCarthy as they relate to claim 6. Stanland discloses double core rolls, but fails to disclose or suggest a door and discloses only mandrels that are offset axially. Therefore, Brown, McCarthy, and Stanland fail to disclose or suggest every limitation of claim 6 and the claims that depend from it.

In view of the above, Applicants' respectfully request reconsideration of the application in the form of a Notice of Allowance. If a phone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues related to this matter, please contact Applicants' attorney listed below at 612.371.5387.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: Jan. 4, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Joshua N. Randall'.

Joshua N. Randall  
Reg. No. 50,719  
JNR:ae